a lube and the oil change on the family jalopy and the minor tune-up. Of course it is a little disappointing to the family who earns over \$320,000 a year. They would only get \$1,200. One cannot buy a Yukon Denali for \$1,200; but I think that they could probably finance one, and it would be a couple of months' payments on a 6-year payment plan. So it is fair.

I hear so much from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we should go to a flat tax; that would be fair. Somehow, to extract money from the American people on a flat tax is fair, but they will say it is not fair to give it back in an equitable way.

Mr. Speaker, my plan is fair, affordable, based in reality, not spending money we do not have. A better plan.

□ 1030

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin) laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Resources:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Washington, DC, February 7, 2001.

Hon. Dennis Hastert,

Speaker of the House, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully tender to you my resignation from the Resources Committee effective today. I have enjoyed the four years I have spent with the Committee and am honored to have had the opportunity.

During my years on the Committee we considered many important measures. We did a great deal of good for the American people and we exercised our oversight responsibilities in a judicious manner. I look forward to continuing this work with the Committee as opportunities arise and on the House floor.

I am pleased to have made many friends among the Committee's membership and developed relationships with the hard working staff. Thank you for the opportunity to serve with such dedicated people.

Sincerely,

KEVIN BRADY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

POTENTIAL FOR WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this special order today to express my concerns for our foreign policy of interventionism that we have essentially followed throughout the 20th century.

Mr. Speaker, foreign military interventionism, a policy the U.S. has followed for over 100 years, encourages war and undermines peace. Even with the good intentions of many who support this policy, it serves the interests of powerful commercial entities.

Perpetual conflicts stimulate military spending. Minimal and small wars too often get out of control and cause more tragedy than originally anticipated. Small wars, like the Persian Gulf War, are more easily tolerated, but the foolishness of an out of-control war like Vietnam is met with resistance from a justifiably aroused Nation.

But both types of conflicts result from the same flawed foreign policy of foreign interventionism. Both types of conflict can be prevented. National security is usually cited to justify our foreign involvement, but this excuse distracts from the real reason we venture so far from home. Influential commercial interests dictate policy of when and where we go. Persian Gulf oil obviously got more attention than genocide in Rwanda.

If one were truly concerned about our security and enhancing peace, one would always opt for a less militaristic policy. It is not a coincidence that U.S. territory and U.S. citizens are the most vulnerable in the world to terrorist attacks.

Escalation of the war on terrorism and not understanding its causes is a dangerous temptation. Not only does foreign interventionism undermine chances for peace and prosperity, it undermines personal liberty. War and preparing for war must always be undertaken at someone's expense. Someone must pay the bills with higher taxes, and someone has to be available to pay with their lives.

It is never the political and industrial leaders who promote the policy who pay. They are the ones who reap the benefits, while at the same time arguing for the policy they claim is designed to protect freedom and prosperity for the very ones being victimized.

Many reasons given for our willingness to police the world sound reasonable: We need to protect our oil; we need to stop cocaine production in Colombia; we need to bring peace in the Middle East; we need to punish our adversaries; we must respond because we are the sole superpower, and it is our responsibility to maintain world order; it is our moral obligation to settle disputes; we must follow up on our dollar diplomacy after sending foreign aid throughout the world. In the old days, it was, we need to stop the spread of communism.

The excuses are endless. But it is rarely mentioned that the lobbyists and the proponents of foreign intervention are the weapons manufacturers, the oil companies, and the recipients of huge contracts for building infrastructures in whatever far corners of the Earth we send our troops. Financial interests have a lot at stake, and it is important for them that the United States maintains its empire.

Not infrequently, ethnic groups will influence foreign policy for reasons other than preserving our security. This type of political pressure can at times be substantial and emotional. We

often try to please too many, and by doing so support both sides of conflicts that have raged for centuries. In the end, our effort can end up unifying our adversaries while alienating our friends.

Over the past 50 years, Congress has allowed our Presidents to usurp the prerogatives the Constitution explicitly gave only to the Congress. The term "foreign policy" is never mentioned in the Constitution, and it was never intended to be monopolized by the President. Going to war was to be strictly a legislative function, not an executive one. Operating foreign policy by executive orders and invoking unratified treaties is a slap in the face to the rule of law and our republican form of government. But that is the way it is currently being done.

U.S. policy over the past 50 years has led to endless illegal military interventions, from Korea to our ongoing war with Iraq and military occupation in the Balkans. Many Americans have died and many others have been wounded or injured or have just simply been forgotten.

Numerous innocent victims living in foreign lands have died as well from the bombings and the blockades we have imposed. They have been people with whom we have had no fight but who were trapped between the bad policy of their own leaders and our eagerness to demonstrate our prowess in the world. Over 500,000 Iraqi children have reportedly died as a consequence of our bombing and denying food and medicine by our embargo.

For over 50 years, there has been a precise move towards one-world government at the expense of our own sovereignty. Our Presidents claim that our authority to wage wars come from the United Nations or NATO resolution, in contradiction to our Constitution and everything our Founding Fathers believed.

U.S. troops are now required to serve under foreign commanders and wear U.N. insignias. Refusal to do so prompts a court-martial.

The past President, before leaving office, signed the 1998 U.N.-Rome treaty indicating our willingness to establish an international criminal court. This gives the U.N. authority to enforce global laws against Americans if ratified by the Senate. But even without ratification, we have gotten to the point where treaties of this sort can be imposed on non-participating nations.

Presidents have, by executive orders, been willing to follow unratified treaties in the past. This is a very dangerous precedent. We already accept the international trade court, the WTO. Trade wars are fought with the court's supervision, and we are only too ready to rewrite our tax laws as the WTO dictates.

The only portion of the major tax bill at the end of the last Congress to be rushed through for the President's signature was the foreign sales corporation changes dictated to us by the WTO.